

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-11, 13-21, 23-25, 27-31 and 33-60 are pending in the application. Claims 1-11, 13-21, 23-25, 27-31 and 33-60 stand rejected.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112***

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1 – 20, 21, 23-25, 27, 31, and 33-36 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the section 112 rejections of claims 1 – 20, 21, 23-25, 27, 31, and 33-36.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103***

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 21, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 50, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57, and 59 stand rejected over US Patent Application Anglin et al., US Application No. 10/410072 (“Anglin”), in view of Nelson US Patent No. 7,158,962 (“Nelson”). Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify the language of the claim and submit that Nelson alone or in combination with Anglin fails to teach or suggest a “hardware/software interface system further configured to generate relationships between a specific item and a subset of item folders in the plurality of item folders, [and] the hardware/software interface system configured to render a user interface that displays the specific Item in each Item Folder of the subset, wherein any modifications to the specific Item in a specific Item Folder of the subset are reflected in each Item Folder of the subset.”

For example, the portion of Nelson referred to in the Office Action states that “when an item’s attributes are changed or the item is redefined ... the item is re-indexed” (Nelson Abstract), and “the automatic linking system 10 will *move* documents from one folder to another if the attributes are changed.” (Nelson, col. 6, lines 8 – 9) (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that moving an item from one folder to another when their attributes change is patentably distinct from rendering a user interface that displays an item in each item folder of a subset of item folders and allowing the item to be manipulated from

each item folder of the subset such that any modifications made to the item in one folder are reflected in the other folders. For example, “access to an Item may occur from different Item Folders, what is actually being accessed is in fact the very same Item.” (Application at paragraph [0126]). Thus, “when an Item is accessed in one Item Folder and revised, this revised Item can then be accessed directly from another Item folder.” (Application at paragraph [0126]). Applicants submit that since the combination of references neither teach or suggest all the claimed limitations, claim 1 patentably defines over Anglin, in view of Nelson. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1.

Insomuch as claims 2 – 11, and 13 – 20 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 they too patentably define over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 2 – 11, and 13 – 20.

Claim 21 recites similar elements to that of claim 1 and patentably defines over Anglin, in view of Nelson for at least the same reason stated above with respect to claim 1. Insomuch as claims 23 – 25, 27 – 31, 33 – 36, depend directly or indirectly from claim 21 they too patentably define over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 21, 23 – 25, 27 – 31, 33 – 36.

Claim 37 recites similar elements to that of claim 1 and patentably defines over Anglin, in view of Nelson for at least the same reason stated above with respect to claim 1. Insomuch as claims 38 - 42, depend directly or indirectly from claim 37 they too patentably define over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 37 – 42.

Claim 43 recites similar elements to that of claim 1 and patentably defines over Anglin, in view of Nelson for at least the same reason stated above with respect to claim 1. Insomuch as claims 44 - 48, depend directly or indirectly from claim 43 they too patentably define over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 43 – 48.

Claim 49 recites similar elements to that of claim 1 and patentably defines over Anglin, in view of Nelson for at least the same reason stated above with respect to claim 1. Insomuch as claims 50 - 54, depend directly or indirectly from claim 49 they too patentably

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-1748/302722.01  
**Application No.:** 10/647,058  
**Office Action Dated:** November 15, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

define over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 49 - 54.

Claim 55 recites similar elements to that of claim 1 and patentably defines over Anglin, in view of Nelson for at least the same reason stated above with respect to claim 1. Insomuch as claims 56 - 60, depend directly or indirectly from claim 55 they too patentably define over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 55 - 60.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections to the claims and issue a Notice of Allowance of all pending claims.

Date: January 15, 2008

/David M. Platz/  
David M. Platz  
Registration No. 60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439